

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 SEAN D. ANDERSON,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 ALLEN K. RICHARDS,

12 Defendant.

CASE NO. C17-58-RSL-BAT

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO COMPEL**

13 Sean D. Anderson moves to Compel Answers to Interrogatories (Dkt. 45). The Court  
14 concludes Mr. Anderson failed to comply with Rule 37. Accordingly, the motion (Dkt. 45) is  
15 denied.

16 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(1):

17 . . . On notice to other parties and all affected persons, a party may move for an  
18 order compelling disclosure or discovery. The motion must include a certification  
19 that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person  
or party failing to make disclosure or discovery in an effort to obtain it without  
court action.

20 Here, Mr. Anderson moves for a Court order compelling defendants to respond to his “initial  
21 interrogatories in a more thorough and non-evasive manner.” Dkt. 45. Mr. Anderson, however,  
22 failed to certify he conferred or attempted to confer with defendants’ counsel regarding the  
23 requested discovery. *Id.* Therefore, Mr. Anderson has not complied with Rule 37.

1 Further, pursuant to the Court's December 26, 2017, Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion  
2 for 15 Additional Interrogatories (Dkt. 43), the deadline by which discovery must be completed  
3 was extended to February 12, 2018. Mr. Anderson's motion was not filed until February 15,  
4 2018 and, as such, is also untimely.<sup>1</sup> Dkt. 45.

5 As Mr. Anderson has not complied with Rule 37 and his Motion to Compel (Dkt. 45) is  
6 untimely, the motion is hereby DENIED.

7 The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to the plaintiff and counsel for defendants.

8  
9 DATED this 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2018.

10  
11   
12 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

---

22 <sup>1</sup> The Court finds it is not necessary to also address defendants' additional arguments in detail. However, the Court  
23 does note that, even if it were to consider the substance of Mr. Anderson's motion, he does not contend that  
defendants have failed to provide answers to his interrogatories but only, it seems, that he would like them answered  
differently. Furthermore, Mr. Anderson fails to identify which answers he believes are deficient or incomplete. Dkt.  
46.